

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN  
FRANCISCO, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

PURDUE PHARMA L.P., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 18-cv-07591-CRB (JSC)

**ORDER DENYING WALGREENS'  
MOTION TO QUASH DEPOSITION**

Re: Dkt. No. 800

Now pending before the Court is a joint discovery dispute letter in which Walgreens seeks to quash the deposition of former Walgreens employee J.G. Dkt. 800. Walgreens argues that the deposition should be quashed because Plaintiff noticed the deposition after the close of fact discovery and the deposition is thus “time-barred.” *Id.* at 1. Plaintiff responds that it did not identify J.G. as a relevant witness until it completed investigations based on documents that Walgreens only recently produced. *Id.* at 2.

The Court denies Walgreens’ request to quash the deposition. While J.G. may not appear by name in the documents that Walgreens recently produced, Plaintiff has adequately explained how it identified J.G. as a relevant witness, namely by conducting further investigations based on the contents of the recently produced documents. And Walgreens does not contend that Plaintiff could or should have identified J.G. based on earlier discovery. Thus, in light of the timing of Walgreens’ productions, Plaintiff diligently noticed the deposition of J.G.

This Order disposes of Dkt. 800.

//

//

//

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: December 6, 2021

  
JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY  
United States Magistrate Judge

United States District Court  
Northern District of California